IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FREDERICK DAVIS

1970 Veterans Highway

C15 East : CIVIL ACTION

Levittown, PA 19056 : No.

.

Plaintiff, v.

THE ESTEE LAUDER COMPANIES, INC.: JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

767 Fifth Avenue, GM Bdg, 38th Floor

New York, NY 10153

and

NORTHTEC, LLC 150 Rittenhouse Circle Bristol, PA 19007

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Frederick Davis, (*hereinafter* referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise), by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action has been initiated by Plaintiff against The Estee Lauder Companies, Inc. and Northtec, LLC (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants") for violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA" - 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 *et. seq.*) and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRA"). Plaintiff asserts, *inter alia*, that he was unlawfully discriminated against and terminated from his employment in violation of state and

¹ Plaintiff's claims under the PHRA are referenced herein for notice purposes. He is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file his lawsuit in advance of same because of the date of issuance of his federal right-to-sue-letter under the ADEA. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will mirror identically his federal claims under the ADEA.

federal law. As a direct consequence of Defendants' unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress of such federal statutes.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because their contacts with this State and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district, in addition, venue is properly laid in this district because Defendants are deemed to reside where they are subject to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendants residents of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for this action.

PARTIES

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 7. Defendant The Estee Lauder Companies, Inc. is an American multinational manufacturer and marketer of skincare, makeup, fragrance and hair care products, based in Midtown Manhattan, New York City. Defendant The Estee Lauder

Companies, Inc. owns a diverse portfolio of brands, distributed internationally through both digital commerce and retail channels.

- 8. Defendant Northtec, LLC is upon information and belief owned by Defendant The Estee Lauder Companies, Inc. and specifically produces perfumes and cosmetics for the same at the above-captioned address.
- 9. Upon information and belief, because of their interrelation of operations, common ownership or management, centralized control of labor relations, common financial controls, and other factors, Defendants are sufficiently interrelated and integrated in their activities, labor relations, ownership and management that they may be treated as a single and/or joint employer for purposes of the instant action.
- 10. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through their agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 11. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 12. Plaintiff is a 56-year-old male.
 - 13. Plaintiff was employed with Defendants for approximately 14 years.
- 14. Plaintiff was originally hired to work for Defendants as a Receiving Supervisor at Defendants' "200 Crossings" building and performed this job for approximately 13 years.
- 15. Throughout his employment with Defendants at the 200 Crossings building, Plaintiff was a dedicated and hard-working employee who performed his job well.

- 16. Plaintiff also received generally positive performance reviews throughout the course of his employment at the 200 Crossings building. However, towards the end of his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff observed Defendants' management terminating and/or pushing out older employees. Unfortunately, Plaintiff was no exception.
- 17. In or about January of 2020, Plaintiff was transferred from the 200 Crossings Building to Defendants' "300 Crossings" building. This transfer came shortly after Plaintiff began observing the aforesaid age discrimination occurring within Defendants (not just as it pertained to him but to other older employees as well).
- 18. For example, shortly before being transferred, Plaintiff was given a terrible performance evaluation which was completely unwarranted, discriminatory in nature and presumably used as a means to push Plaintiff out because of his advanced age.
- 19. After receiving the aforesaid negative performance evaluation (disused *supra*), Plaintiff had an altercation with a younger manager (in his 20s or 30s), Graham Hercock (hereinafter "Hercock").
- 20. Even though both Plaintiff and Hercock were guilty of losing their cool with one another during the aforesaid altercation, Plaintiff was the one transferred to the 300 Crossings building and replaced with a younger individual in his 20s.²
- 21. At or around the same time frame as the aforesaid altercation, Plaintiff made a complaint to Defendants' ethics hotline that he believed there was age discrimination occurring within Defendants and that he was a victim of the same.

² Plaintiff does not include any facts herein regarding his negative performance evaluation or transfer to Defendants' 300 Crossings building in 2020 as a basis for any independent cause of action. Instead, Plaintiff includes such facts for the purpose of establishing a history age discrimination and retaliation.

- 22. Plaintiff's aforesaid complaint of age discrimination was not taken seriously or properly investigated. Instead, Plaintiff was informed by Executive Director of Human Resources, Craig Shand, that there was no merit to Plaintiff's claims and the matter was being closed.
- 23. Over the next year, while working within Defendants' 300 Crossings building, Plaintiff was still considered a "Receiving Supervisor;" however, he was not performing the role of a Receiving Supervisor.
- 24. Instead, while working at Defendants' 300 Crossings building, Plaintiff was placed on mid-shift, performing tedious tasks and training younger and newly hired supervisors to perform all his previous job duties.
- 25. In addition to the foregoing, Plaintiff was also being advised by Defendants' management on a constant basis to issue discipline to older employees (rather than younger employees).
- 26. Plaintiff believed that the treatment he and others were receiving from Defendants' management (outlined in Paragraph 24 and 25 of the instant Civil Action Complaint) was again motivated by age and because he had expressed concerns of age discrimination (as to the treatment he was receiving specifically).
- 27. Therefore, on several occasions leading up to his ultimate termination from Defendants, Plaintiff apprised Defendants' management, including but not limited to his direct supervisor at the 300 Crossings building Christopher Galeone (20s-30s), of his aforesaid concerns regarding age discrimination and retaliation on several occasions, but Plaintiff was ignored.

28. The hostile work environment continued and in or about September of 2020, Plaintiff was placed on a 90-day Performance Improvement Plan ("PIP"), even though he had received no write ups regarding his performance since the aforesaid negative performance review that he was given while working at the 200 Crossings building (almost a year prior).

29. On the last day of the performance review period, Plaintiff was informed that he had improved but due to a recent safety issue (wherein he did not say something to an employee who was using a yellow safety knife on the receiving dock), he was being terminated from his employment.

30. The aforesaid issue for which Plaintiff was allegedly terminated occurred three weeks prior and based on Defendants' past practices, Plaintiff believes that the reason for his termination was completely pretextual and that Defendants were just using this as an excuse to terminate him.

31. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that he was really terminated from Defendants in January of 2021 because of his advanced age and/or because he complained of age discrimination.

Count I <u>Violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act "ADEA"</u> (Age Discrimination & Retaliation)

- 32. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 33. Plaintiff properly exhausted his administrative remedies by filing with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and initiating this lawsuit within 90 days of receipt of a right-to-sue letter and/or notice of dismissal.

- 34. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that he was subjected to a hostile work environment, placed on a PIP, and ultimately terminated due to his advanced age and/or because of his complaints of age discrimination (on multiple occasions in advance of his termination).
 - 35. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the ADEA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary, pay increases, bonuses, insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement, and seniority.
- B. Plaintiff is to be awarded liquidated damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for their willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendants or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- C. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper, and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress / pain and suffering);
- D. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law; and
 - E. Plaintiff is to be given a jury trial as demanded in the caption of this Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Road Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: September 14, 2021

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

<u>Celephone</u>	FAX Number	E-Mail Address			
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com			
)ate	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for			
9/14/2021		Plaintiff			
f) Standard Management -	- Cases that do not fall int	o any one of the other tracks.	(X)		
commonly referred to a	s complex and that need s	tracks (a) through (d) that are pecial or intense management by ailed explanation of special	()		
 d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. 					
c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
 b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. 					
a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MA	NAGEMENT TRACKS:			
plaintiff shall complete a Cifiling the complaint and servande of this form.) In the designation, that defendant the plaintiff and all other pate which that defendant bel	ase Management Track Dove a copy on all defendants event that a defendant down shall, with its first appearanties, a Case Management leves the case should be as		me of		
The Estee Lauder Com	•	NO.			
v.	:				
Frederick Davis		CIVIL ACTION			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:21-cv-04083-JDWed Squirsons 1_{RICT} led U2/14/21 Page 10 of 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 1970 Veterans Highway, C15 East, Levittown, PA 19056								
Address of Plaintiff. 1770 Veterans Highway, C13 East, Ecvitown, TA 17030 Address of Defendant: 767 Fifth Avenue, GM Bdg, 38th Floor, New York, NY 10153 / 150 Rittenhouse Circle, Bristol, PA 19007								
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business								
Trace of Accident, incident of Transaction.								
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:								
Case Number: Judge:	Date Terminated:							
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:								
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered sui previously terminated action in this court?	pending or within one year Yes No X							
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same pending or within one year previously terminated action in this case.								
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent all numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated								
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X								
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.								
DATE: 9/14/2021 ARK2484 / 91538								
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)								
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)								
CIVIL: (Place a $$ in one category only) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:							
 A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 	s							
 A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 	s							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify):							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights	s							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARB (The effect of this certification)	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): A. D. K. of	S							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARB (The effect of this certification of the contract of the contrac	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): In is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) PRATION CERTIFICATION In its to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) In the product of the damages recoverable in this civil action case							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARB. (The effect of this certification I, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record of pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the bese	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): In is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) PRATION CERTIFICATION In its to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) In the product of the damages recoverable in this civil action case							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARB (The effect of this certification in the properties of	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): In is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) PRATION CERTIFICATION In its to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) In the product of the damages recoverable in this civil action case							

Case 2:21-cv-04083-JDW_Document 1_Filed 09/14/21 Page 11 of 11 CIVIL COVER SHEET

provided by local rules of court purpose of initiating the civil de	This form, approved by the ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT)	e Judicial Conference of TONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	the United States in September THIS FORM.)	er 1974, is required for the use of the	ne Clerk of Court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DAVIS, FREDERICK (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Bucks (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			DEFENDAN	DEFENDANTS THE ESTEE LAUDER COMPANIES, INC., ET AL.		
			THE ESTEE I			
			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	•		Attorneys (If Kno	wn)		
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, Suite 128, Bensalem, PA						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in On	te Box Only)		F PRINCIPAL PARTIES	-	
1 U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Or Citizen of This State	PTF DEF 1 1 Incorporated or Prii			
2 U.S. Government 4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State	2 2 Incorporated <i>and</i> Pr of Business In .			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		y) RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALI		of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	, 315 Airplane Product Liability , 320 Assault, Libel & Slander , 330 Federal Employers' Liability , 340 Marine , 345 Marine Product Liability , 350 Motor Vehicle , 355 Motor Vehicle , 355 Motor Vehicle , 360 Other Personal Injury , 360 Personal Injury , Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS J 440 Other Civil Rights , 441 Voting X 442 Employment , 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment , 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Parsonal Injury - Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	of Property 21 USC 8 of Property 21 USC 8 for Froperty 21 USC 8 f	28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 3 820 Copyrights 3 830 Patent 3 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application 3 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 4 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 4 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act ' 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
X1 Original 2 Re	moved from	Appellate Court	Reopened Ar	ansferred from 0 6 Multidist nother District Litigation necify) Transfer		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ADEA (29USC62	21)	e filing (Do not cite jurisdictional	statutes unless diversity):		
	Violations of the	ADEA and the PHI				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS 1 UNDER RULE 23	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	rif demanded in complaint: XYes 'No	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 9/14/2021		SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEY OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE LISE ONLY	e de la constante de la consta	11				

Print

AMOUNT

RECEIPT#

Save As..

APPLYING IFP

MAG. JUDGE

JUDGE